



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/723,535	11/26/2003	Uwe Klinger	16104-015001 / 2003P00897	8674
32864	7590	05/06/2009	EXAMINER	
FISH & RICHARDSON, P.C. PO BOX 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022			PESIN, BORIS M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2174	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/06/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PATDOCTC@fr.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/723,535	KLINGER, UWE	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	BORIS PESIN	2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 January 2009.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-13, 16, 17, 22 and 60 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-13, 16-17, 22, and 60 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

This communication is responsive to the amendment filed 1/30/2009.

Claims 1-13, 16-17, 22 and 60 are pending in this application. Claims 1 and 60 are independent claims. In the amendment filed 1/30/2009, Claims 1 and 60 were amended. This action is made Final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-13, 16-17, 22, and 60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Slotznick (6011537) in view of Brown et al. (US 7010581)

Re claim 1, Slotznick discloses a method of providing navigation in a browser, the method comprising:

displaying a first application page in a browser on a client device, the first application page being received from a server device and relating to a first state of an application program on the server device, the browser having a back function and a forward function (see column 18 lines 11-14 according to the numbering in the middle and column 37 lines 24-25 for example);

receiving an input from a user while the first application page is being displayed, the input requesting one of the back function and the forward function (see column 37 lines 24-25 for example).

Slotnick does not specifically teach generating a request from the client device to the server device in response to the input, the request generated by the client device executing code that the server device has previously provided to the client device, the request corresponding to the requested one of the back function and the forward function for the first application page, and instructing the server device to change the application program from the first function to a second state; and receiving at the client device and displaying in the browser a second application page provided by the server device in response to the receiving the request.

Brown teaches generating a request from the client device to the server device in response to the input, the request generated by the client device executing code that the server device has previously provided to the client device, the request corresponding to the requested one of the back function and the forward function for the first application page, and instructing the server device to change the application program from the first function to a second state (See Figures 2 and 4, the server sends

the client "Back" and "Forward" buttons which the user can use to request different pages from the server. The Back and Forward buttons mimic the standard browser buttons but are encoded in the web page so as to provide the same functionality to all users.) ; and receiving at the client device and displaying in the browser a second application page provided by the server device in response to the receiving the request (See Figure 4).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Slotznick with the teachings of Brown and imbed a forward and a back button in the web page with the motivation to provide every user a standardized web page. Thus, when a user does not use a standard browser, he or she would still have the standard browser functionalities.

Re claim 2, Slotznic-Brown discloses a method, further comprising loading at least one invisible page in the browser such that the first application page is visible in the browser after the at least one invisible page has been loaded (see Slotznick column 15 lines 5-6, lines 14-20, lines 32-36 for example).

Re claim 3, Slotznic-Brown discloses a method, wherein loading the at least one invisible page comprises loading a first invisible page and then a second invisible page in the browser (different secondary information for example, see Slotznick column 16 lines 15-18).

Re claim 4, Slotznic-Brown discloses a method, further comprising again loading the first invisible page if the input requests the back function (Slotznick column 17 lines 47 and lines 54-59 for example).

Re claim 5, Slotznick discloses a method, wherein again loading the first invisible page triggers generation of the request (Slotznick column 15 lines 5-6, lines 14-20, lines 32-36 for example).

Re claim 6, Slotznic-Brown discloses a method, further comprising storing information in a cookie on the client device to identify that the first invisible page is again being loaded in response to receiving the input requesting the back function (see Slotznick column 15 lines 41-44, column 16 lines 29-33 for example).

Re claim 7, Slotznic-Brown discloses a method, further comprising activating the back function after loading the second invisible page and again loading the first invisible page (Slotznick column 17 lines 47, lines 54-59 for example).

Re claim 8, Slotznic-Brown discloses a method, further comprising again loading the second invisible page if the input requests the forward function (Slotznick column 37 lines 24-25 for example).

Re claim 9, Slotznic-Brown discloses a method, wherein again loading the second invisible page triggers generation of the request (Slotznick column 16 lines 15-20 and column 37 lines 24-25 for example).

Re claim 10, Slotznic-Brown discloses a method, further comprising storing information in a cookie on the client device to identify that the second invisible page is

again being loaded in response to receiving the input requesting the forward function (Slotznick column 15 lines 41-44, column 16 lines 29-33 for example).

Re claim 11, Slotznic-Brown discloses a method, further comprising loading a third invisible page in the browser after loading the second invisible page and activating the back function after loading the third invisible page and again loading the second invisible page (Slotznick column 16 lines 15-20 for example).

Re claim 12, Slotznic-Brown discloses a method, further comprising: again loading the first invisible page if the input requests the back function; and again loading the third invisible page if the input requests the forward function (Slotznick column 16 lines 15-20, c37 lines 24-25 for example).

Re claim 13, Slotznic-Brown discloses a method, wherein generation of the request is triggered by again loading one of the first and third invisible pages (Slotznick column 16 lines 15-20 for example).

Re claim 16, Slotznic-Brown discloses a method, wherein the request comprises that a measure taken on the server device be undone (inherent function of forward and backward for example, see Slotznick column 37 lines 24-25).

Re claim 17, Slotznic-Brown discloses a method, wherein the request comprises that a measure taken on the server device that has been undone should be redone (see Slotznick column 37 lines 24-25 for example).

Re claim 22, Slotznic-Brown discloses a method, wherein the application page is received from the server device in response to a request sent from the client device (Slotznick column 18 lines 11-14 for example).

Claim 60 is similar in scope to claim 1; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-13, 16-17, 22 and 60 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Inquiry

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BORIS PESIN whose telephone number is (571)272-4070. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday except every other Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Boris Pesin/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2174